



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

Clement, and, also, that Alexander obtained the fifth succession from Peter and Paul.\*

Optatus gives the same succession, except that he places Clement before Anacletus.\*

Rufinus, in his preface to the Recognitions of Clement, says, that it was the common opinion that Linus, Cletus, and Clemens succeeded as Bishops of Rome while St. Peter was still alive, and adds—"Some inquire how, seeing Linus and Cletus were bishops in the city of Rome before Clement, Clement himself writing to James, could say, that the See was delivered to him by Peter; whereof this reason has been given us (mark, he does not give it as his own supposition merely, but as he had it by tradition from others)—viz., that Linus and Cletus were, indeed, Bishops of Rome before Clement, while Peter was yet living—viz., that they might take the charge of the bishopric, while he, himself, fulfilled the office of the apostleship."

St. Epiphanius assigns the same reason for the appointment of Linus, Cletus, and Clemens as Bishops of Rome—viz., "Because the Apostles Peter and Paul did take journeys into other countries for preaching Christ, but the city of Rome could not be without a bishop."

St. Epiphanius tells us that Peter often visited Pontus and Bithynia, and alludes, also, to St. Paul having visited Spain.\*

Cardinal Baronius goes still further, and asserts that it was the office of St. Peter, as an apostle, not to stay in one place, but as much as it was possible for one man to travel over the whole world, and to bring those who did not yet believe to the faith, but thoroughly to establish believers.\*

St. Chrysostom shows, that the offices of Apostle and Bishop are in truth inconsistent; "the Apostles being rulers ordained by God, rulers not taking several nations and cities, but all of them in common entrusted with the whole world." Whereas, Bishops are pastors who "do sit, and are employed in one place."

Baronius also (in p. 537) enumerates the names of a variety of Churches which claim to have been planted by St. Peter or his disciples—Mauritania, Numidia, Britain, all Italy, Gaul, Spain, Africa, Sicily, &c., &c., and in another place, A.D. xxxix, p. 272, says, "How could he who had the care, not of one city only, but of all Christendom; who was bound to provide for all, to visit all, if he could, to instruct, to admonish all—in short, to feed the whole flock entrusted to him—how could he (and especially in times when the Christian faith was everywhere assailed, both by Jews and Gentiles—how could he be confined within the limits of one city, however dignified, and not rather (as St. Luke testifies he did) go round and visit all the Churches?"

What a powerful and convincing reason to satisfy any reflecting mind that St. Peter never undertook the office of Bishop of Rome—an office the duties of which he well knew were incompatible with his higher engagements as an Apostle!

We have other cogent reasons to give why we do not believe that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome, but we pause here to ask whether any of our correspondents, or any other advocate of the Roman Catholic Church, will try to get over any of the three difficulties we have already suggested.

In the meantime, will our readers believe that in the foregoing article we have actually been dealing with what are usually considered by Roman Catholics as some of the strongest passages and arguments which the advocates of the Papacy have ever adduced in favour of the key-stone of their whole system—viz., the (disputed) fact that St. Peter was ever Bishop of Rome.

## THE DOUAY BIBLE, ITS HISTORY AND AUTHORITY.

WE have already devoted several pages to the discussion of the numerous important and interesting questions connected with the Roman Catholic English Bible.\* Our chief object has been to open the eyes of our Roman Catholic readers to the remarkable fact that the present Douay Bible differs from the original one in a multitude of places; and that, in the great majority of instances, the changes which have been made are corrections introduced from the Protestant authorised version. We propose in this article to add some further particulars relative to the history and authority of this famous Douay Bible.

It could have been no light cause that led to the translation of the Bible into English by Roman Catholics; for it is a recognised dogma of the Church of Rome that vernacular translations of the Bible are not necessary for the laity, and that they should not be allowed to use them without the express sanction of a bishop or priest. It is true, this fact has been often and indignantly denied by Roman Catholics; but the evidence on which it rests is too strong to be overthrown by mere assertion. It is now more than six centuries since the Council of Toulouse (A.D. 1229) made its famous 14th Canon, prohibiting the laity from possessing either the New or Old Testament; but, down to the present hour, the Vatican has never intimated its disapprobation of the sentiments expressed by that Council, or in any way declared that the Scriptures are the property of the laity as well as the clergy, and ought to be read and studied by all. It was this undisputed aversion of the ruling powers of the Church of Rome to the reading of the Scriptures that forced many writers of that communion to invent all kinds of silly and ridiculous reasons why vernacular versions should not be permitted. One of these reasons, expounded by a learned professor at Douay, about the beginning of the 17th century, is so curious that it is worth reproducing here:—"Because," says Dr. Kellison, "Christ sanctified three tongues with the title of the Cross, to wit, Hebrew, Greek, and Latin; therefore the Church would have God's Word not to be written commonly in any other tongue than one of those three sanctified tongues." In other words, because Pilate wrote the inscription on the Cross in Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (in order that every one might read it), therefore the written Word of God ought to be limited to the same three languages (in order that the multitude may not be able to read it)! A hundred years later, Roman Catholics found it more prudent, when writing for Protestants, to adopt a different tone in reference to the circulation of the Scriptures. Dr. Milner, for example, thus writes in the year 1808 (*Tour in Ireland, Letter xviii.*)—"With respect to the laity, she (the Church of Rome) never interdicted the Bible to them, as Protestants suppose; but she enjoined that those who took the mysterious Book in hand should have received such a tincture of learning as to be able to read it in one or other of the learned languages, unless their pastor judged, from their good sense and good dispositions, that they would derive no mischief from reading it in the vulgar tongue. At present, however, the Catholic prelates do not think it necessary to enforce even this restriction; and, accordingly, you may find in the shops of all the principal booksellers in Ireland, Bibles in folio, in quarto, and in octavo, which are indiscriminately offered for sale with the entire approbation of those prelates." And some years later (1825), Dr. Doyle, in his examination before a committee of the House of Lords, stated—"That we have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity of our Church, is best proved by the great many editions it has gone through in Ireland, under our express sanction; and to which editions there is prefixed a rescript of Pius VI., directed to a prelate in Italy called Martini, who had translated the Bible out of the Vulgate into the Italian language. We prefix this rescript of Pius VI. to our editions in English of the Bible, in order to show that not only we, but the head of our Church is joined with us in exhorting the faithful to read the word of God... So that, of all things said of us, there is not anything said of us more opposed to truth than that we are averse to the circulation of the Word of God."—*Phelan's Digest of Evidence*, &c., I, p. 221.

Such are the statements made by Roman Catholic divines, when speaking or writing for Protestants.\* But, on suitable occasions, and before fit hearers, their language is very different. Thus, the same Dr. Milner elsewhere not only admits, but justifies, the restrictions placed by his Church on the reading of Scripture:—"Substituting," he says, "the dead letter of the text for the living voice of the Church, is the ready means of undermining the Catholic

faith."—(*Suppl. Mem. of Eng. Cath.*, p. 244.) The late Mr. Sheil re-echoed the same sentiment in a speech made at Cork, in the year 1824, in the course of which he said—"There was one point which he would concede to those whom he opposed. If it were a triumph, they might have it. He would confess that reading the Bible was subversive of the Roman Catholic Church."—(*Report of the Discussions*, &c., p. 40.) Nor are these antiquated notions. Cardinal Wiseman, the highest Roman Catholic functionary in this empire, has deliberately recorded his opinion on the subject in a recent pamphlet, entitled "*The Catholic doctrine on the use of the Bible*." He thus writes (p. 20), "If, therefore, we be asked, why we do not give the Bible indifferently to all; and the shutting up (as it is called) of God's word be disdainfully thrown in our face; we will not seek to elude the question, or meet the taunt by denial, or by attempts to prove that our principles on this subject are not antagonistic to those of Protestants. They are antagonistic: and we glory in avowing it." And again (p. 26), "But though the Scriptures may be here permitted, we do not urge them on our people: we do not encourage them to read them: we do not spread them to the utmost among them: certainly not."

Such being the established and avowed sentiments of the Church of Rome respecting the circulation of the Scriptures among the laity, it could have been, as we have said, no light motive which induced such devoted adherents as the founders of the College at Douay to undertake a translation of them into English; especially at that time, when the opposition to everything having the remotest affinity with Protestant principles was most violent and determined. What, then, was this motive? It may be stated very briefly;—necessity. When the English Protestant versions made during the reign of Henry VIII. had, despite of all opposition, become so widely diffused among the people that all notion of suppressing the circulation of God's Word was abandoned as hopeless, the adherents of Rome had no other resource than to neutralize as much as possible its effect by vilifying the English Bible, and branding it with every opprobrious epithet they could invent. It was called "the Devil's Book," "the Gospel of the Devil," "the Devil's Word." But they soon began to perceive that this mode of proceeding was attended with but poor success, and that the reading of the English Bible was becoming more and more general. They accordingly were compelled to change their tactics; and, as a matter of sheer necessity, they judged it advisable to set forth a rival version of their own.

Accordingly, in the year 1582, an edition of the New Testament in English was published at Rheims, whither the College of Douay (established fourteen years before) had been temporarily transferred. This version was furnished with a copious body of annotations, fiercely polemical in their tone, and assailing in the bitterest and most abusive terms the Protestant Versions. The translation was chiefly the work of Gregory Martin. The Annotations were supplied by Cardinal Allen and Dr. Bristow.

In the Preface we are told the reasons which led to the making of the Version:—"Not upon erroneous opinion of necessity, that the Holy Scriptures should always be in our mother tongues, or that they ought or were ordained by God to be read indifferently of all, or could be easily understood of every one that readeth and heareth them in a known language; or that they were not often, through man's malice and infirmity, pernicious and much hurtful to many, or that we generally and absolutely deemed it more convenient in itself, and more agreeable to God's word and honour, or edification of the faithful, to have them turned into vulgar tongues, than to be kept and studied only in the ecclesiastical and learned languages: not from these or any such like causes do we translate the sacred book, but upon special consideration of the present time, state, and condition of our country, into which divers things are either necessary or profitable and medicinal now, that otherwise in the peace of the Church were neither much requisite, nor perchance wholly tolerable." We, therefore, having compassion to see our beloved countrymen, with extreme danger of their souls, to use only such profane translations and erroneous men's mere phantasies for the pure and blessed word of truth... have set forth the New Testament, to begin withal, trusting that it may give occasion, after diligent perusal thereof, to lay away at least such impure versions as you (benign readers) have been hitherto forced to occupy." Such were the motives which induced the divines of Douay to translate the Bible into English. Their zeal does not appear to have found much favour with the heads of their Church, if we may judge from the fact that no less than twenty-seven years elapsed between the publication of the New Testament and the Old. The translation of the New Testament appeared, as we have said, at Rheims, in the year 1582. That of the Old was published at Douay 1609, 1610.<sup>†</sup> In the Preface to the former we are told that the translation of the whole Bible was finished, but that the Old Testament could not yet be published for want of funds. It is not likely that this cause alone would have prevented the publication for a space of nearly thirty years. It is worthy of remark that

\* These epithets were applied, amongst others, by Gregory Martin, the translator of the Rheims Testament, and Matthew Kellison, whose words have been quoted above. The case of Brother John, the Mayo Monk, is fresh in the recollection of us all: vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, April, 1852.

† The year before the publication of the English Authorised Version.

\* "ἐπιπλην ἀπὸ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου κατὰ γὰρ διαδοχῇ."—Book iv., c. 1.

\* Lino successit Clemens, Clementi Anacletus, Anacleto Evaristus, Evaristo Alexander, Alexandro Sixtus, &c.—Lib. ii. Dupin's Ed. p. 31. We may here observe that the learned Jesuits Labbe and Corsart, whose "*Concilia Generalia*" we have on often occasion to quote, in vol. xvi., page 130, give a list of the Bishops of Rome, in which Cletus and Anacletus are treated as distinct persons, one of whom preceded Clemens, and the other succeeded him. See CATHOLIC LAYMAN, vol. ii., p. 137. Dr. Milner, also, in his End of Controversy (letter xviii., note), assumes Cletus and Anacletus to be distinct persons.

\* Quidam enim requirunt quo modo, cum Linus et Cletus in urbe Roma ante Clementem huic fuerint Episcopi, ipse Clemens, ad Jacobum scribens, sibi dicat a Petro decendi Cathedram traditam, cujus rei hanc acceptum esse rationem, quod Linus et Cletus fuerint quidem ante Clementem Episcopi in urbe Roma, sed superante Petro; videlicet ut illi Episcopatus curam gererent, ipse vero Apostolicus impleret officium."—Rufin., in Pref. ad Clem. Recogn.

\* Πλὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ οὕτως ἡδύνατο εἶναι περίουτων τῶν Ἀποστόλων, φημί δὲ τῶν περὶ Πέτρου καὶ Παύλου, Επισκόπους ἄλλους καθίστασθαι, διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἀποστόλους πολλάκις ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας πατρίδας τὴν πορείαν στέλλεσθαι, διὰ τὸ κήρυγμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ μὴ δύνασθαι δὲ τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων πόλιν ἀνεῖν Ἐπισκοπῶν ἐναι.—Epir. Hæres. 27, ut supra.

\* Πέτρος πολλάκις Ἰόντον καὶ Βιθυνίαν ἐπισκεψάτο.—Id.—Petrus vero Pontum ac Bithyniam sæpenuvero peragravit.

\* Baron. Annales, 58. Sec 51, vol. i, p. 536.

\* Ἀρχοντὲς εἰσιν ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ χειροτονηθέντες οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἄρχοντες οὐκ ἐθνικὰ καὶ πόλεις διαφόρους λαμβάνοντες, ἀλλὰ πάντες κοινῇ τὴν διουμένην ἐμπιστεύοντες.—Chryst. op. tom. 8, p. 115. Paris, 1838.

\* Ὅτι καθήμενοι καὶ περὶ ἕνα τόπον ἡσυχάζομενοι.—Id. in Ep. d. 11, tom. 11. p. 95.

\* Vide CATHOLIC LAYMAN, Vol. I., p. 42. Vol. II., pp. 49, 61, 74, Vol. IV., p. 75.

\* Our materials are for the most part taken from Archdeacon Cotton's valuable work, entitled "Rheims and Douay."

\* Answer to Sulliffe, p. 157, Rheims, 1608 (the year before the publication of the Douay Bible).

\* As a comment on this bold statement about the abundance of Bibles, in all sizes, to be found in the bookseller's shops of Ireland, Dr. Cotton says, "I assert deliberately that, at that time, the only editions procurable were, one in large folio, published at about £4; one in 4to, published at £3 8s. 3d.; and the remnants of two Edinburgh editions, in five large 12mo. vols. the latter of which editions was advertised by Coyne of Dublin, at the price of £1 12s. 6d., in boards; a few copies on fine paper, hot-pressed, price in super-extra binding, £3 3s. 3d." Bibles at these prices, might, doubtless, be "indiscriminately offered" for sale, as Dr. Milner says; but we need hardly ask, How many copies would be bought?

the Rheims Testament, having been published before the revision of the Vulgate by Sixtus V. and Clement VIII. (1590-92), follows the uncorrected and unauthorized Latin text. With respect to the Old Testament, the editors tell us in the Preface, that they "have again conferred this English translation, and conformed it to the most perfect Latin edition."

Thus, then, was completed what is called the Douay Bible. It has undergone many changes since. Those who may not have an opportunity of referring to the work in its original shape may wish to know the judgment pronounced on it by one of the most eminent biblical critics of the last century, and himself a Roman Catholic priest, Dr. Geddes. "The English Catholics," he writes in the year 1793, "had no alternative for more than a century but to put up with a barbarous translation, made at Rheims and Douay, from an uncorrected copy of the Latin Vulgate, accompanied with virulent annotations against the Protestant religion, and manifestly calculated to support a system, not of genuine Catholicity, but of transalpine Popery." He adds, "About the middle of the present century (the 18th), it was indeed remodelled on the Clementine edition of the Vulgate, and modernised into somewhat better English by the late Dr. Chaloner, who put it into a more convenient form, and stript it of almost all its most odious notes; yet still, in those which he retained or altered, the spirit of theologic system is but too visible; and as to the translation itself, the changes in it are chiefly made from that same Common Version (the English authorised version) which had been so much vilified and burlesqued by our rhimers and divines."

During the century which Dr. Geddes alludes to, this "barbarous translation" does not appear to have been much read, inasmuch as we know, that between the second and third editions of the Old Testament no less an interval than 114 years elapsed; whilst between the fourth and fifth editions of the New Testament, the interval was 105 years.<sup>a</sup> This fact furnishes a striking comment on Dr. Doyle's assertion, above quoted—"We have no aversion to the reading of the Bible, and to the possession of it by the laity of our Church."

The subsequent history of the Douay Bible we shall reserve for our next Number.

### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

WE have read somewhere what appears very worthy of reflection, that "if men are to hate and persecute one another on account of religion, it should be as amongst the people of Egypt, of whom one served one deity, and the other a different one."

"Inter finitimos vetus atque antiqua simul  
Immortale odium, et nunquam sanabile vulnus  
Ardet adhuc Ombos, et Tentyræ; summus utriusque  
Unde furor vulgo, quod numina vicinorum  
Olit uterque locus, quum solos credat habendos  
Esse Deos, quos ipse colit."—*Juvenal*, 15 Sat. 33.<sup>a</sup>

That men, who worship the same Deity, and that a benignant one, should think they did their God service by persecuting and injuring one another would seem incomprehensible, if we did not know it by experience to be a lamentable truth.

The religion of Mahomet, we know, was undisguisably propagated by the sword; and his followers were expressly enjoined to make use of force to destroy all other systems of religion. "When you meet with infidels," says Mahomet, in the 9th chapter of the Alcoran, "kill them, cut off their heads, or take them prisoners, and bind them till they have paid their ransom, or till you find it proper to set them at liberty. Do not be afraid to persecute them, till they have laid down their arms, and submitted to you."

The rule of Mahomet is that which has been most largely practised in the world, even by those who deny his authority, and denounce him as an impostor. Earnestness and intolerance have, indeed, generally gone hand in hand, and the way of the world, in general, has been to persecute all who differ from them.

The Gospel, on the other hand, enjoins the mildest and tenderest treatment towards those who oppose themselves to it. It frequently warns the disciples of Christ that they must suffer persecution; but it never tells them to return evil for evil, or authorises, much less enjoins, them to persecute their opponents, or compel them by fire or sword to embrace her faith and doctrine.

When Peter drew his sword in defence of our Lord himself, and struck the high priest's servant, Malchus, and cut off his right ear (an incident which was so much at variance with the whole tenor of the conduct of Christ and his followers, that it has been recorded by each of the four evangelists (Matt. xxvi., v. 51, Mark, xiv., v. 47, Luke, xxii., v. 49-51, John, xviii., v. 10, 11)—"Jesus rebuked him, saying, 'put up thy sword into the sheath, for all they that

take the sword shall perish with the sword; and he touched his ear and healed him."

Again, when the Samaritans would not receive him, and James and John, excited, doubtless, by their zeal, asked him, "Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven and consume them, even as Elias did?" his reply was characteristic of the whole of his teaching, "He turned and rebuked him, and said, 'ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of, for the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to save them; and they went to another village.'—Luke ix., 53 6.

Christians, instead of being commanded to persecute, were commanded only to preach and instruct, to be ever ready to give a reason for the faith that is in them, and in meekness instructing those who oppose themselves. Let us reflect a little, and see whether this method of Christ is not the only truly wise and philosophical one.

What is religion? and in what does it consist?

The essence of religion consists in the opinions which the mind forms of God, and the emotions of respect, fear, and love which we entertain towards him. It is in the interior disposition and inward persuasion of the mind that the essence of true and saving religion obviously consists. The Gospel, consequently, treats man as a reasonable being, endowed with a manly judgment, which can only be influenced and spiritualized by light and evidence and persuasion, not by external pressure. "It is one thing," says the great mental philosopher, Locke, "to persuade, another to command; one thing to prop with arguments, another with punishments. It is light and evidence only that can work a change in men's opinions, and that light can in no manner proceed from corporal sufferings, or any other outward penalties."

"No way whatsoever that I shall walk in against the dictates of my conscience," says the same eminent philosopher, "will ever bring me to the mansions of the blessed. I may gain rest by an act that I take not delight in; I may be cured of some disease by remedies that I have not faith in; but I cannot be saved by a religion that I distrust, and by a worship that I abhor. Faith only and inward sincerity are the things that procure acceptance with God, and there is no such way of propagating truth as when strong arguments and good reason are joined with softness of civility and good usage."

The nature of the human understanding is, indeed, such that it cannot be compelled to the belief of anything by outward force. "You might as well," says Bishop Jeremy Taylor, in his forcible and quaint manner, "cure the colic by brushing a man's clothes, or fill his stomach with a syllogism, as attempt to convince his understanding by corporal afflictions. Force, in matters of opinion, can never do good, but is very apt to do harm, and make men hypocrites instead of believers, and so, instead of erecting a trophy to God and true religion, build a monument to the devil!"

"But it ceases not there. The use of force spreads further, and acts on others in the opposite direction to that desired. There is a popular pity that follows all persons in misery, and compassion often begets bitterness of affections, and that not unfrequently bitterness of persuasion, and so much the rather, because there arises a jealous and pregnant suspicion that they who persecute an opinion are destitute of sufficient arguments to confute it, and, therefore, find the hangman the best disputant."

It is, then, clear that the only practicable, as well as the only legitimate, way of inspiring such religion, is to apply persuasion, and such means and arguments as are calculated to lead the judgment in the way desired; and that to resort to threats, penalties, banishment, blows, or any other species of punishment, must be a false way of promoting any religion which has truth on its side and something better than persecution to recommend it to the world. External acts may, indeed, be compelled, and many men may readily be induced, by the apprehension of bodily sufferings or the loss of their temporal goods, hypocritically to conform to the religious ceremonies of the strongest party; but mere external acts of homage and honour, rendered by one who has no suitable sentiments towards the object to be worshipped, is no more a real honour to God than the prostration of a statue, overturned by the wind at the feet of a passing sovereign, would be a real homage by the statue to the king.

While, however, true philosophy and true Christianity so completely concur in this important matter, what a sad contrast has the practice of Christians exhibited even when compared with the despised followers of Mahomet!

The religious tenets of the latter expressly authorized and enjoined them to persecute; but the Saracens seem to have early discovered that the methods enjoined by their leader were not effectual ones—at least against Christianity. They soon, therefore, left off the violent methods, and the result is that the Greek Church, instead of being extinguished, has maintained itself to this day under the yoke of Mahomet. They have their Patriarchs, their Metropolitans, their synods, their discipline, and their monks. The contrast is a sad one, but we believe it to be not the less true, that there is no manner of comparison between the cruelty of the Saracens to the Christians, and that of some Christians, calling themselves, by way of exclusion, Catholics, towards other Christians whom they call heretics. In a few years of war against the Vaudois, or even in the massacre of St. Bartholomew alone, Christians shed more blood for the cause of religion than the

Saracens spilt in all their persecutions against the Christians. The Mahometans have, no doubt, in other ways, made the Christians pay very dear for their liberty of conscience; they imposed heavy tributes on them, and caused them frequently to redeem their churches, which they sometimes sold to the Jews, and afterwards obliged the Christians to buy back again; but it was the avarice of the Mahometans, rather than their cruelty, of which the Christians had reason to complain. It is a lamentable satire on Christianity, but we can scarcely dissent from the observations of the eminent French writer, who says upon this subject:—"One may be quite satisfied that if the Christians of the West had borne sway in Asia, in the room of the Saracens and Turks, there would not at this day remain the least traces of the Greek Church, nor would they have tolerated Mahometanism, as the infidels there have tolerated Christianity." Let us, however, inquire a little more closely into the matter, and, admitting that actual violence is neither legitimate nor efficacious as a means of inculcating religion, may there not still be limits and qualifications to the doctrine of universal toleration, which a wise and good government may adopt, and circumstances under which a resort to the secular arm may still be right and necessary?

In matters relating to social and moral duty, we, of course, do not deny the right of the civil power to interfere; for, obviously, no one has the right to propagate immoral or anti-social principles—principles which would undermine the foundations of civil society, and poison the fountains of public and private happiness at their source; but in matters of mere religious truth or falsehood, things which touch not the relations of man to man, but are matter between each man and his God, we hold they have no right whatever to interfere. It is no part of the duty of the civil government to uphold or to propagate religious truth—much less to punish those who differ from what it considers to be such; and if governments have no right or power to control or punish their subjects, assuredly individuals have no right to control or punish one another in matters of religious belief, where every man's conscience should be free to adopt and publicly to profess whatever opinions he is sincerely convinced are founded in truth.

But, how then, some will say, is truth to be maintained, when once adopted; if any one is to be at liberty to attack and undermine it without opposition or punishment?

One would think, from the anxiety which some persons express about truth, that it was made of very perishable materials, and had no inherent power whatever to protect itself. Such persons would preserve truth as if it were a china vessel, or rather as if, while as brilliant, it was also as brittle as glass. And yet how inconsistent are such persons in this matter. One day, they will, in the most sublime terms, represent truth to be as steady and immovable as a rock, and, at another time, they will tell us that it must be by no means exposed to the dangers of controversy, which is a most dangerous rock, on which truth is ever likely to split! Both of these things cannot be true; either the former is the mere language of bombast, in which such persons themselves do not believe, or the latter cowardly distrust, which does the greatest dishonour to the character of truth.

We never asserted, however, that every or any one ought to be at liberty to attack or undermine truth, without opposition. Let every opposition, every persuasion, every exertion, consistent with perfect freedom of conscience, be used to prevent men from abandoning what we believe to be the truth, and to induce others to abandon what we believe to be error. No zeal, no earnestness, no perseverance can be too great in a cause so sacred and so glorious. But that opposition should go beyond legitimate persuasion, which can and ought alone to operate upon the human mind, and degenerate into pains and penalties, which never did and never ought to influence any man's sincere opinions, there we commence our solemn protest, in the name of Jesus, whose whole life on earth was one continued practical exemplification of the sacred truth we are attempting to defend and illustrate, and a living personification of the humility, the patience, the meekness of the religion He came down from Heaven to teach, when He said unto his disciples—"Learn of me, for I am meek and lowly of heart, and ye shall find rest unto your souls"—in the name of that Jesus who, so far from affording an example of compulsion, is compared to a lamb, led to the slaughter without a complaint—in the name of that Jesus who said, "Blessed are the meek, the peacemakers, the merciful, for theirs is the kingdom of God"—Jesus who, in the midst of all the outrages committed on him, revenged not himself, but "committed Himself to him who judges righteously;" who commanded that we should bless those who curse us, and pray for those who despitefully use us and persecute us: we solemnly protest against any and every species of intolerance or coercion in matters of religion.

We might fill whole pages without exhausting a variety of the touching eloquence of the Gospel in support of this view, but we shall limit ourselves to but two examples more, which appear to be peculiarly illustrative of it. When Jesus was warning his disciples of the persecution which awaited them, far from permitting them to persecute the unbelievers in return, He distinctly tells them that they are to seek safety only in flight—"If they persecute you in one city, flee ye to another (Matt. x. 23). He does not say, try to raise an insurrection against those

<sup>a</sup> Dr. Geddes does not seem to attach much weight to the statement of the editors of the Douay Old Testament, to the effect that they had "conformed the translation to the most perfect Latin edition."

A second edition of the Douay Old Testament was published at Rouen, in 1635, being 25 years after the first. The next edition was that of Dr. Chaloner, in 1719. The fourth edition of the Rheims Testament was published in 1632; and the next in 1728.

<sup>b</sup> "An old grudge, to immortal hatred turned,

Between the Tentyrites and Ombites burned;

A wound in these two neighbour towns past cure;

Because that neither people will endure

Their neighbours' deities; nor will have more

Worship to gods than they themselves adore."